

**NAVAL AIR STATION (NAS) ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING SUMMARY**

Building 1, Suite #140, Community Conference Room
Alameda Point
Alameda, California

Tuesday, 2 May 2000

ATTENDEES:

See the attached list.

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Approval of Minutes

Mary Sutter, Community Co-chair, commenced the meeting at 6:40 p.m. She called for changes to the April minutes. Mary Rose Cassa, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), noted that on page 2, first paragraph, second sentence, "Weisenborn" should be amended to "Weissenborn." Also, on page 12, third paragraph, first sentence, "Petochoff" should be amended to "Petouhoff." Ms. Sutter moved to receive the April minutes as amended; all were in favor.

II. Co-Chair Announcements

Ms. Sutter encouraged all to take some Alameda Point brochures that were provided at the meeting and also distributed on Earth Day. Ms. Sutter thanked the Navy for the use of the large RAB poster boards that were displayed at the RAB's booth on Earth Day. She noted that although the RAB's community outreach efforts on Earth Day resulted in a RAB application from John Roullier, a Coast Guard housing resident, she felt that the public's interest level was lower than expected. Elizabeth Johnson, Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority (ARRA), stated that the City has applied for a Superfund demonstration grant for assistance on the remedy design for Installation Restoration (IR) Sites 1 and 17 (golf course and marina). Ms. Sutter added that if the application is granted, the City will solicit community input.

Ms. Sutter distributed the following documents during the meeting: correspondence from Carol Barker, Department of Toxic Substances, to Marty Martinson regarding the firefighter situation; the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Record of Decision (ROD); and the annual issue of the Navy Environmental Restoration Smart Cleanup. All of the documents were returned to Ms. Sutter at the close of the meeting. She stated that she also received a copy of the Operable Unit 3 (OU-3) Addendum to the Feasibility Study (FS), which was also sent to Mary Masters,

Technical Outreach Services for Communities (TOSC), for review; comments are due by 1 June.

Mike McClelland, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and Navy Co-chair, announced that the Action Memo (AM) for the Removal Action for the Marsh Crust/East Housing was signed; the AM, as well as the comments and responses to comments, are available at both information repositories. He stated that Maria Villafuerte has replaced Darlene Robbins as the project manager at Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. (GPI); GPI provides RAB support.

III. OU-3 Sampling Results

Bill Kaktis, EFA West, stated that he will no longer hold the position of project manager after a couple of months. He stated that after the remedial investigation (RI) was completed last summer, the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) recommended further characterization on soil-gas and groundwater. A couple of reports on the unexploded ordnance (UXO) investigation, as well as the RI Addendum, have been issued. Additional information is pending on the radiological risk assessment, and the Draft Final FS will be issued in August. He encouraged attendees to contact Steve Edde, Environmental Liaison, for copies of the documents.

Nadia Burleson, Tetra Tech EM, Inc. (TtEMI), gave a presentation on the status of the FS and the results of the data gap sampling that was conducted last December. She explained that about one month prior to the submission of the Draft FS and Final RI, TtEMI participated in a BCT meeting, it was discussed that data gaps needed to be filled prior to finalizing the FS. For groundwater, they include: taking three samples to delineate the eastern boundary of the hot spot; and taking about ten hydropunch samples on the shoreline in other areas to ensure that no aquatic risk exists outside of the hot spot. As the three samples on the eastern boundary were below the screening level, step-out sampling was not deemed necessary.

Ms. Burleson stated that IR Site 1 is located in the northwest corner of Alameda Point; it borders the Oakland inner harbor to the north, and the San Francisco Bay to the west. It was used as a landfill between 1943 and 1956; it accepted municipal waste, industrial waste, UXO, and radium-painted dials. Site 1 will be used as a golf course and regional park trail. The groundwater is not considered to be a source of drinking water. The proposed remedy entails a landfill cap, which is a soil cover with an impermeable layer; and groundwater treatment for the groundwater hot spot. She referred to a map of Site 1 on which she located the landfill cells and the groundwater hot spot, noting that the boundaries were redone to include all of the areas where the radiological surveys were conducted.

Ms. Burleson stated that the Final RI Report and Draft FS were submitted last August. The remedial action objectives for the landfill are to protect human health and the environment from contact with landfill refuse; and to protect human health from exposure to constituents in the

soil that pose an unacceptable risk. A soil cover was placed over the landfill when it was closed in 1956. Neither the construction details, nor the origin of the soil, is known. A human health risk assessment found that there was an unacceptable risk in the shallow soil itself, which is one reason why an additional cover will be put in place over the existing one.

Ms. Burleson stated that because the groundwater is not considered to be drinking water, the remedial action objective for groundwater is to protect aquatic receptors from exposure to constituents that exceed screening levels in the bay. An additional groundwater risk was volatilization through the soil into ambient air for recreational receptors. Groundwater modeling showed no risk, which was confirmed by the data gap sampling results.

Ms. Burleson noted the remedial alternatives in the Draft FS. For landfill cells, they include: no action; a permeable cover (a native compacted soil cover that helps to promote drainage over the landfill and prevents contact with landfill refuse); and an impermeable cover (polyethylene liner to prevent excessive migration of water into the landfill). Both types of covers will include a barrier that will limit the burrowing of animals.

For the groundwater hot spot, the remedial alternatives include: no action; impermeable vertical barrier (slurry wall); mechanical excavation and off-site disposal of soil; funnel and gate system (consists of an iron-reactive wall through which groundwater flows, chlorinated constituents are treated, and then pass through a biosparge zone where oxygen is injected to degrade petroleum and other constituents); groundwater extraction and treatment; in situ chemical oxidation (injecting hydrogen peroxide or some other type of oxygen compound that would chemically oxidize the contaminants); and in situ air sparging (a venting system that volatilizes the constituents from the groundwater and are then removed with a vapor extraction system in the unsaturated zone).

Ms. Burleson stated that removal actions are being considered for the UXO and radiological dials, but it could become part of the FS. The UXO and radiological anomalies will be removed prior to installing the landfill cover. Modeling in the RI showed an inhalation risk to human receptors from the groundwater hot spot.

There was an assumption in the Draft FS that no landfill gas would be produced, as it has been closed for about 50 years. To confirm this, a subsurface landfill gas survey was taken from all seven landfill cells; the depth of the existing covers were also measured. About four shallow landfill gas samples were taken per cell at about three feet below ground surface (bgs). Two surface emission samples were taken per cell. The results show that methane is being produced, which invalidates the assumption in the Draft FS. There was no risk from other emissions of vapors from the landfill. The Final FS will incorporate a passive venting system. No methane was detected on the surface of the landfill, although there were localized hot spots throughout the landfill.

Ms. Burleson stated that the Draft FS is under review by regulatory agencies and the RAB. The impacts are as follows: for groundwater, chemical oxidation will be screened out as it may be explosive when coming into contact with methane. Also, there is no unacceptable risk to humans from the volatilization pathway. With regard to the landfill cap, a passive vent system will be required; at least two feet of soil covers the refuse. She noted that it was difficult to determine the location of the refuse as in some cases, the refuse went down below four feet. The Draft Final FS is scheduled for submission at the end of August.

James Leach asked if some of the landfills are under the runway. Ms. Burleson replied in the affirmative. Samples were taken beneath the asphalt, but not beneath the runway as the landfill design will keep the runway as a base. In response to Mr. Leach's comment, Ms. Burleson stated that the landfills precede the runway. She added that a lot of grading was done to rebuild the runway, which may be another reason why there is a lot more soil over the refuse than was anticipated.

Doug DeHaan asked as to the location of the passive venting system. Ms. Burleson stated that due to the multiple spots with methane, the passive venting system will likely be located throughout the landfill. Pre-design testing will be conducted. Mr. DeHaan asked how long the venting system will be in place. Ms. Burleson replied that it will remain until there is no more contamination. She added that emission controls will be considered in the design to ensure that there is no unacceptable risk from any vents within the landfill cap.

Daniel Zerga asked if the passive vents will need to penetrate through the runway. Ms. Burleson replied in the negative, as the path of least resistance will not likely be through the runway. She stated that the design has not been done as yet. She confirmed that if there is methane underneath the runway, it will find its way out through the passive venting system.

Tony Dover asked if there is any possibility that the methane is originating from the bay mud. Ms. Burleson replied that she is not familiar with the characteristics of the bay mud. She opined that the methane is likely coming from the refuse, although the origin of the methane is something that can be looked into. Mr. Dover asked as to the thickness of the landfill cap. She replied that the minimum thickness of the native soil cap is two feet; the actual thickness will be determined during the design phase.

Ms. Sutter inquired if the risk assessment considered irrigation as a possible use for the groundwater. Ms. Burleson replied that this was considered in the Final RI Report. Modeling was also used to determine where the irrigation wells will likely be installed; a risk assessment found that it was within an acceptable risk range. Ms. Johnson added that the golf course FS did not consider the groundwater due to its brackish quality; "EBMUD [East Bay Municipal Utility District]," water was considered instead.

In response to Ken O'Donoghue's inquiry, Ms. Burleson stated that they will work with the golf course developer with respect to the soil cap. Mr. O'Donoghue asked if the cap will follow the existing contours of the landfill. She replied that the design will include regrading to limit infiltration. Mr. Kaktis added that Site 1 is about one-tenth of the golf course.

Mr. Leach mentioned that water hazards are usually excavated. Ms. Burleson reiterated that Site 1 comprises one-tenth of the golf course. She stated that all of the normal design features of a golf course can certainly be put in place; the integrity of the cap must be maintained and there must be adequate drainage. She added that these issues will be considered in the design. Ms. Sutter stated that the development plan involves a links course, which will not have as many water hazards. Bert Morgan added that more sand traps will likely be built. He inquired as to the permeability of the cap given the amount of water poured onto a golf course. Ms. Burleson replied that drainage will be part of the design.

Jo-Lynne Lee stated that the assumption is that it will be a golf course forever, adding that once the cap is designed, it will not be possible to alter it. Ms. Burleson commented that any future reuse plan will need to consider the integrity of the cap. Mr. DeHaan asked as to the type of material that will be used for the cap. Ms. Burleson replied that the cap can be made of native soil. If it is impermeable, the material will be made of clay that is compacted to 10 to the minus 6 (10 X -6) with a high-density polyethylene liner.

Mr. Edde added that the conceptual design has a recycling system for irrigation water; Ms. Johnson confirmed this fact, adding that a liner will likely be needed between the landfill cover and the golf course to allow for drainage to a central channel. Mr. DeHaan inquired if the possibility of water infiltration into the bay was considered. Ms. Burleson stated that the design will include vertical containment along the shoreline; a sediment study was also done. Mr. Edde added that there will be monitoring wells around the perimeter; these will be checked periodically. Ms. Burleson stated that many of the impermeable walls were installed for leachate containment. She added that water infiltration is not really an issue at this landfill, and that there is only one spot where there is a risk.

Ms. Sutter asked as to how the added weight of the cap will affect the top of the landfill. Ms. Burleson replied that there has probably been some compaction already, given the grading for the runway and the passage of time. Putting in place an extra two feet of soil for the cap will have minimal impact on the refuse; most of the settling comes from the decomposition of the wastes, the majority of which has already happened over the last 50 years.

Ms. Lee inquired about the hot spot. Ms. Burleson replied that the following five chemicals were found: 1,2 dichloroethene, 2 chlordinomethylphenol, 2 methylphenol, toluene and xylene. Ms. Johnson added that the golf course FS considered the settlement resulting from a layer that is at least three feet across, at least one-third of which would be borne by the runway; it was determined that there would be minimal impact.

IV. Project Teams, Round the Table

OU-1 RI

Mr. McClelland stated that Patricia McFadden is no longer on the focus group. He will inform the RAB as to her replacement.

OU-2 Project Team

Mr. McClelland will inform the RAB as to the new lead remedial project manager (RPM).

OU-3 Project Team

Ms. Sutter reiterated that Ms. Masters is reviewing the Addendum; comments are due on 1 June.

Ecology Focus/OU-4/Sediments

Ms. Lee stated that Dianne Behm has an excused absence.

Administration

Ms. Sutter noted that Lyn Stirewalt should be added to the focus group. Mr. Morgan moved to vote on Mr. Roullier's application; all were in favor, none were opposed, none abstained.

EBS/Tiered Screening/Transfer Documentation

Ms. Lee stated Warren Yip provided an update on the status of the EBS; she noted that there has been a lot of positive movement on the EBS. Depending on availability, Mr. Yip will arrange for contractors to give a presentation to the RAB. The focus group will comment on a couple of pending reports.

Radiological

There was no report on this topic.

Site 25/Estuary Park/Community Outreach

Ms. Lee noted that on Earth Day, she received comments pertaining to the difficulty in visualizing the location of activities on the base. Ms. Lee suggested that a map be utilized for outreach efforts.

Petroleum CAP

Mr. Edde encouraged Mr. O'Donoghue to call him with respect to who the new RPM will be.

Marsh Crust

Mr. Leach stated that the focus group submitted its comments to the City. He noted that the focus group has no authority to enforce the recommendations. Ken Kloc stated that Arc Ecology commented on the Draft Removal Action Workplan and the Negative Declaration for the East

Housing Area at Alameda Point; the comments will be included in the monthly mailing. These comments are similar to those submitted by the RAB.

V. BCT Activities

Ms. Cassa gave an update on the topics discussed during the previous month's BCT meetings. Data gap sampling was discussed for Sites 14, 15, 6, and 16. Sites 14 and 1 are sites on which more groundwater and soil sampling needs to be done. Site 15 needs additional soil sampling outside of the existing fence line. Sites 6 and 16 need additional groundwater sampling.

On 18 April, a presentation was given by a group which includes the U.S. Air Force, Cornell University, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regarding Reductive Anaerobic In-Situ Treatment Technology (groundwater treatability study near Building 4). She commented that the study was scientifically robust; it is one of five sites involved in the study. The final report is pending and will be made available in the RAB library; some interim information has been provided. In response to Ms. Sutter's inquiry, Ms. Cassa stated that the objective was to reduce chlorinated solvents through the injection of a chemical into the groundwater which stimulates the microbes.

On the same day, sampling options for Sites 14 and 15 were discussed. There was also a presentation by Michael Pound, Sediments Work Group (SWG), Southwest Division. Mr. Pound presented the proposal for an upcoming data summary report. Ms. Cassa noted that the SWG is receptive to comments from the BCT.

On 20 April, a meeting was held between most of the key players from all of the stakeholders, including the City and their environmental consultants, EPA, and the Navy. The participants met to familiarize themselves with the new Navy team members, some of whom are not new per se, but were reassigned to new positions. A strategy for closure was discussed, as well as the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) schedule, which includes the remedial design and remedial action.

VI. Community and RAB Comment Period

In response to Mr. Torrey's inquiry, Mr. Kloc explained that under the Comprehensive Environmental Restoration Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), a community member can petition the EPA to do a preliminary assessment of any area that is thought to be contaminated. Mr. Kloc circulated a petition for the areas within the marsh crust that were not formerly Navy property; he has received some responses. He encouraged community members to send the forms directly to the EPA administrator at Region IX; he requested that respondents use the correct zip code for the EPA's San Francisco office (94105).

Mr. Leach stated that page 27 of the Navy Environmental Restoration Smart Cleanup shows a picture of a carrier coming in under the San Francisco/Oakland Bay Bridge. Although it is noted as a Port of Oakland historic photo, no part of Oakland is shown. Ms. Sutter noted that the Port of Oakland was put in the wrong place; Anna-Marie Cook, U.S. EPA, commented that Alameda was put in the wrong place. Ms. Sutter added that on page 517, a notation indicates that one site was closed at NAS Alameda; she commented that she was unaware that a site has been completed.

Ms. Lee asked as to the status of the FFA. Ms. Cook stated that this is an iterative process, but that most of the text is ready. The next step is to send it to the Navy. The EPA is trying to get the Navy's schedule to mesh with the regulatory agencies' suggested schedule. It is currently being held up by OU-4. It is hoped that by the end of the fiscal year, this process will be completed. Mr. McClelland asked if the Concord FFA has reached Roger Green's office; she replied that it has gone higher than that. The Navy had one significant comment pertaining to a change, to which the EPA agreed. She explained that the Concord FFA is significant in that it is the model for the NAS Alameda FFA. It is anticipated that once the Concord FFA goes through, neither the Navy nor the EPA will have any more significant changes for the NAS Alameda FFA.

Ms. Sutter noted that the first Tuesday in July is on July 4; she inquired if the RAB would like to change the meeting date. The RAB changed the meeting date to the following Tuesday, 11 July. She and Mr. McClelland requested that a flyer be enclosed in the monthly mailing regarding the new July meeting date.

VII. Early Transfer - City Perspective

Jeff Bond, City of Alameda, has been involved with the Catellus project as a development manager for the last year. He has been working with the City for about six years. He presented the City's reaction to last month's presentation on the early transfer process, given by Dennis Kelly. Mr. Bond commented that Mr. Kelly's perspective was fair but somewhat rosy. He opined that Mr. Kelly's perspective pertains to the military's view of base reuse and cleanup.

Mr. Bond stated that from the community's perspective, there are different elements to be considered with respect to the pros and cons. One of the pros is that early transfer is the fastest way to achieve conveyance and reuse. In the case of the FISC property, two significant IR sites (about 14 out of 215 acres) require active remediation; the Navy will be responsible for cleanup. Mr. Bond noted that with an early transfer, the bulk of the site can be reused while remediation takes place. Secondly, combining development and cleanup results in cost savings. In addition, it is advantageous to put a mechanism in place that will deal with issues such as unexpected contaminants.

Mr. Bond stated that on the downside, there is a risk that the "cleanup tail" wags the "reuse plan dog." That is, the early transfer process could result in the redesign of land uses in order to save money; this redesign would be based on the environmental condition of the property, rather than on the community's original reuse plan. He acknowledged that balance needs to be achieved between the objective of saving taxpayers' money and developing the base in the way that the community wants to do it. This is the most challenging part of the early transfer process.

Mr. Bond noted that the Navy often uses the Port of Oakland as an example of a successful early transfer. The Port took a measured risk to generate a tremendous amount of revenues, while the Navy's cleanup cost was decreased. He stated that this model does not apply to the City of Alameda. As a municipal government, the City has a tighter budget than does the Port. Although insurance products can protect the City, it takes time and energy to deal with insurance companies in the event of a claim. Dealing with unexpected contamination that is not covered by insurance could use up the City's funds.

In response to Mr. DeHaan's inquiry, Mr. Bond explained that the City's approach is that the Navy will be responsible for the cleanup of the IR sites, as part of the terms of the early transfer of the Catellus portion of the FISC Annex. This is subject to community input. With those particular IR sites, the Navy's estimate for cleanup is less than the estimate from the City and Catellus. Mr. DeHaan asked as to the difference in cost estimates. Mr. Bond replied that it is based on differences in professional opinion. Ms. Cassa explained that as the remedial design has not been determined, the remedy has not been identified. Therefore, contractors for the Navy and for the City are estimating the cleanup cost based on a spectrum of remedial options.

Mr. Bond added that the Navy's estimate is based on the best case scenario, whereas the estimate from Catellus and the City is based on the worst case scenario. However, this does not jeopardize the projected time line. Ms. Cassa and Mr. Bond confirmed that the developer's estimate is more conservative than is the Navy's estimate.

Ms. Lee asked how the development and cleanup can be integrated, when the remedy is as yet undetermined. Mr. Bond replied that some of the IR sites are located in the future business parks, where some of the cleanup costs are not as high as compared to the estimated costs for unrestricted residential use. Ms. Lee commented that the whole process seems to be sketchy with respect to whether or not cleanup and development will be integrated, and if there will be any cost savings at all. Mr. Bond replied that although a final remedy has not yet been determined, the site is well-characterized.

Ms. Cassa added that one site within the Annex is highly contaminated with petroleum; this is where the difference in estimates occurs. Corrective action is being discussed; cleanup has not been addressed as yet. The only site that is relatively far along is the one that has the worst CERCLA contamination of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and cadmium down to six inches.

This is a straightforward cleanup. With respect to the final remedy, Ms. Cassa commented that future negotiations may continue once additional information is obtained.

Ms. Sutter asked as to the City's perspective regarding early transfer for all or parts of Alameda Point. Mr. Bond replied that because the City is not familiar with the condition of the various IR sites, the City would likely begin building in extra contingencies. It was agreed that the City would take over the property one site at a time, as more information is obtained.

In response to Ms. Lee's comment, Mr. McClelland stated that there are a number of clean parcels that can be processed under regular transfer, as opposed to early transfer, once the ROD is reached for the marsh crust. Mr. DeHaan commented that parcel-by-parcel transfer may result in a patchwork-type development. Mr. Bond replied that the Navy's budget priorities necessitates this type of development.

In response to Ms. Sutter's inquiry about the reuse plan, Ms. Johnson explained that there is a large area called the housing overlay where housing would potentially be built. Ms. Cassa added that there is only one relatively small area that will be zoned for industrial use in perpetuity; this is located on the southeastern corner of Site 13 (inner harbor area). In response to Kevin Reilly's inquiry, Ms. Johnson stated that the general plan is currently in process. Mr. Bond confirmed that it is a high priority.

Ms. Sutter asked as to the extent of the RAB's involvement in the cleanup process in the event of an early transfer. Mr. Bond replied that he expects that the RAB will continue in some form until the cleanup is done. Mr. DeHaan asked as to the steps that need to be taken in the event that the City does not respond to the RAB's concerns about the marsh crust. Ms. Sutter stated that the resolution has not yet been forwarded to the City; it will be sent within the week. Mr. DeHaan stated that the RAB is expecting a response from the City on the matter; Mr. Bond acknowledged his comment.

Ms. Sutter adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

The next Restoration Advisory Board Meeting will be held at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, 6 June 2000, in Building 1, 1st floor, Suite #140, Community Conference Room, Alameda Point.

ATTACHMENT – LIST OF ATTENDEES

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING SUMMARY

THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED ATTACHMENT IS NOT
AVAILABLE.

EXTENSIVE RESEARCH WAS PERFORMED BY
SOUTHWEST DIVISION TO LOCATE THIS
ATTACHMENT. THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INSERTED
AS A PLACEHOLDER AND WILL BE REPLACED
SHOULD THE MISSING ITEM BE LOCATED.

QUESTIONS MAY BE DIRECTED TO:

DIANE C. SILVA
RECORDS MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST
SOUTHWEST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
1220 PACIFIC HIGHWAY
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132

TELEPHONE: (619) 532-3676